

2017 TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Per Section 20019 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), UDOT and its subrecipients are required to develop and implement a Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM).



UDOT Program
Development

Public Transit
Team

Contents

Acronyms	2
Introduction.....	3
Utah Department of Transportation, Public Transit Team.....	3
Transit Asset Management	3
Purpose of the Transit Asset Management Plan	6
Transit Asset Management Plan	6
Transit Asset Management Methodology	9
Asset Portfolio and Condition Assessment.....	11
Performance Targets	12
Management Approach.....	13
Prioritization and Risk Management.....	13
FTA Section 5310 Program	13
Section 5311 and Section 5339.....	13
Site Visits and Inspections	13
Reporting and Performance Measure Oversight.....	14
Vehicle Title and Lien.....	14
Useful Life	14
Appendix A.....	17
Vehicles	18
Facilities.....	27
Equipment.....	29
Appendix b.....	30

ACRONYMS

BTA	Basin Transit Administration
CVTD	Cache Valley Transit District
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act
PCT	Park City Transit
PTT	Public Transit Team
SGR	state of good repair
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Plan
TAM	Transit Asset Management
TERM	Transit Economic Requirements Model
UDOT	Utah Department of Transportation
ULB	useful life benchmark
UTA	Utah Transit Authority

INTRODUCTION

Utah Department of Transportation, Public Transit Team

Pursuant to 49, U.S.C 5301 et seq. the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is the designated recipient and the agency responsible for administering the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Sections 5304, 5310, 5311, 5329, and 5339 formula grant programs for all areas outside of Utah's large urbanized area ranging from approximately Provo, Utah to Brigham City, Utah—commonly known as the Wasatch Front. This area also includes the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) service area (see Figure 1). The UDOT Public Transit Team (PTT) is responsible for ensuring the fair and equitable distribution of FTA funds; announcing the program and availability of funds; developing a process to solicit, review, and approve eligible funding sources; providing management and technical assistance to applicants and grantees; administering and monitoring contracts; and ensuring compliance with federal requirements by all subrecipients.

The PTT holds title to federal assets until the federally recognized useful life has been met, and there is no federal interest remaining in the asset (see Figure 2). The public transportation providers in Utah range in size and scale from daily fixed route to non-profit demand response services. Mobility is critical to quality of life; these providers offer connectivity to medical, nutrition, education, employment, social, recreation, and commercial services. Approximately 3.8 million trips are provided annually by the 54 fixed route and demand response agencies eligible or previously eligible for FTA funds administered through the PTT. With the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act of 2012 (MAP-21), UTA became the direct recipient of FTA's Section 5310 formula grant program in the Wasatch Front. Similar to the PTT, public transportation providers located within the Wasatch Front apply to UTA for federal funding; consequently, the PTT holds title to several federal assets within this area that were procured with Section 5310 funds prior to the passage of MAP-21. Currently, only agencies outside of the Wasatch Front apply to the PTT for FTA funds needed for rural fixed route transit, demand response, intercity bus, and planning and mobility management needs.

MAP-21 also required the Secretary of Transportation to develop rules to establish a system to monitor and manage public transportation assets to improve safety and increase reliability and performance, and to establish performance measures. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act reaffirmed this requirement. On July 26, 2016, FTA published the Transit Asset Management (TAM) final rule.

TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT

TAM is the strategic and systematic practice of procuring, operating, inspecting, maintaining, rehabilitating, and replacing transit capital assets to manage their performance, risk, and costs over their life cycles to provide safe, cost-effective, and reliable public transportation. TAM uses transit asset condition to guide managing capital assets and prioritizing funding to improve or maintain a state of good repair (SGR).

Figure 1. Wasatch Front, Large Urbanized Area





Figure 2. Statewide Agencies with Public Transit Team Funded Assets with Federal Interest



Purpose of the Transit Asset Management Plan

The purpose of the TAM is to aid the PTT in achieving and maintaining an SGR of all public transportation assets in the state of Utah. **SGR is the condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of performance.** This means that the asset:

1. Is able to perform its designed function
2. Does not pose a known unacceptable safety risk
3. Lifecycle investments have been met or recovered

Transit Asset Management Plan

The TAM final rule requires every transit provider that receives federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 to develop a TAM plan or be a part of a TAM group plan prepared by a sponsor (UDOT PTT). All TAM plans must contain four major components:

1. **Inventory of assets:** A list of capital assets (vehicles, facilities, and equipment) that support the delivery of public transportation services in Utah
2. **Condition assessment of inventoried assets:** Includes the current asset condition and how the actual condition compares to the target set for each asset category
3. **Management Approach:** Includes prioritization, risk management, and compliance
4. **Prioritization of investments:** Outlines the proposed investments and any applicable capital investment activity schedules


The TAM final rule groups transit providers into two classifications:

- **Tier I:** Providers own, operate, or manage rail, more than 100 vehicles across all fixed-route modes, or more than 100 vehicles in one non-fixed route mode
- **Tier II:** Providers are subrecipients of Section 5311 funds, Section 5310, American Indian Tribe, or own, operate, or manage less than 101 vehicles across all fixed route modes, or less than 101 vehicles in one non-fixed route mode; Tier II transit providers can submit their own TAM plan or join a TAM group plan

As a large urban provider, UTA is the only provider that meets the requirements of a Tier 1 transit provider. UTA also manages all FTA Section 5310 funds and is responsible for all Section 5310 funded assets (beginning with 2013 funds) within the UTA service area (see Figure 1). The Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD) meets the criteria of a Tier II transit provider, but has opted to develop their own TAM plan. Statewide fixed route transit providers and their TAM classification include:

- UTA: Tier 1 (individual TAM plan)
- CVTD: Tier II (individual TAM plan)
- Park City Transit (PCT): Tier II (TAM group plan)
- Basin Transit Administration (BTA): Tier II (TAM group plan)
- SunTran (St. George): Tier II (TAM group plan)
- Cedar Area Transit (CATs): Tier II (TAM group plan)

Figure 3. Fixed Route Transit Providers



In addition to the fixed route transit providers included in the PTT TAM group plan, 54 demand response providers are participants in the plan (see Table 1). Regardless of whether an agency develops its own TAM plan or chooses to participate in a group plan, each transit agency must designate an Accountable Executive to ensure that the necessary resources are available to provide ongoing safety review and management of the assets. Upon acceptance of federal assets, PTT requires that the individual within an agency who has direct control over these responsibilities be identified. This individual is also responsible for ensuring that all FTA Certifications and Assurances are clearly understood and that the annual affirmation is signed and submitted back to the PTT.

Table 1. PTT TAM Group Plan Participating Agencies

Transit Asset Management - Statewide Agencies					
1	Active Re-Entry	19	Emery County Nursing Home Inc. (Emery County Care and Rehab)	37	Piute County Senior Citizen Center
2	Bear River Valley Senior Center/Tremonton City	20	Emery County Senior Citizens, Inc.	38	Red Rock Center for Independence
3	Beaver Area Health Care Foundation	21	EnableUtah	39	Salt Lake County Aging Services
4	Beaver County Senior Citizens Organization Inc.	22	Foundations for Independence	40	Sevier County
5	Cache County Corporation Senior Citizens	23	Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	41	Southwest Behavioral Health Center
6	Cache Employment and Training Center	24	Garfield County	42	SPLORE
7	Cedar City Corporation	25	Greyhound Lines Inc.	43	Summit County
8	City of Draper (SCCC)	26	Iron County Aging Council	44	Suntran
9	City of Midvale (SCCC)	27	Kane County Senior Citizens Improvement Corp	45	Transitions, Inc.
10	City of Sandy (SCCC)	28	Kostopulos Dream Foundation/Camp Kostopulos	46	Tri-County Independent Living Center of Utah
11	City of South Jordan	29	Milford Memorial Hospital Association	47	TURN Community Services
12	City of South Salt Lake	30	Navajo Nation Transit System	48	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
13	City of West Jordan (SCCC)	31	Neighborhood House Association	49	Uintah Healthcare Special Service District
14	Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	32	Odyssey House	50	United Way Community Services
15	Community Careers and Support Services	33	Options for Independence	51	USU - CPD - Developmental Skills Laboratory
16	Davis County Senior Services Davis County Courthouse Annex	34	Pahvant Valley Senior Citizens	52	Ute Tribe Transit
17	Duchesne County Senior Citizens	35	Park City Transit	53	Washington County
18	East Juab Senior Citizens Organization	36	Payson Senior Citizens Development	54	Work Activity Center

Transit Asset Management Methodology

The PTT routinely procures light, medium, and heavy duty vehicles. However, the PTT has participated in funding several transit facilities and associated equipment. In order to identify the required performance targets, a condition assessment of each FTA funded asset was required. When conducting a condition assessment, it is important to first identify what factors are taken into account and what that data entails. The PTT applied the following criteria to determine the asset condition:

- Asset type
- Useful life
- Useful life benchmark (ULB)
- Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM)/Rating
- Vehicle mileage
- User rating

Useful life—the expected lifetime of project property or the acceptable period of use in service varies based on vehicle and facility type. The useful life of rolling stock begins on the date the vehicle is placed in revenue service and continues until it is removed from service. While the PTT utilizes the FTA standards for determining useful life (see Table 2), the PTT revised the FTA standard for medium-size cutaways from five to seven years. The change is a result of several demand response providers using their vehicles intermittently and not approaching the useful life mileage standard for the vehicle type.

Table 2. Useful Life Standards

Vehicle	Approximate GVWR (pounds)	Length (feet)	Seats	Useful Life
Large, heavy-duty transit bus	33,000–40,000	35–40+	35–40	12 years or 500,000 miles
Medium-size heavy-duty transit bus	26,000–33,000	30–35	25–35	10 years or 350,000 miles
Medium-size medium-duty transit bus and truck chassis cutaway	10,000–26,000	25–30	16–30	7 years or 200,000 miles
Medium-size, light-duty bus and van chassis cutaway	10,000–16,000	20–25	12–16	7 years or 150,000 miles
Small light-duty bus, modified vans, modified minivans	6,000–14,000	<20	3–14	5 years or 100,000 miles

While the useful life of a vehicle is utilized to determine the eligibility for vehicle replacement, for the purpose of this plan, FTA has provided guidance to determine the maximum age of an asset—or the point in which an asset enters the SGR backlog. The FTA defines ULB as the expected lifecycle of a capital asset for a particular transit provider’s operating environment or the acceptable period of use in service for a particular transit provider’s operating environment. The ULB takes into account a provider’s unique operating environment such as geography and service frequency (see Table 3). For the purposes of this plan, the PTT utilizes the default ULB as a criteria in determining the condition of an asset.

Additionally, PTT combined FTA's TERM scale (see Table 4) to the existing vehicle mileage for each vehicle type in order to apply a rating for the mileage criteria (see Tables 5–9). The TERM scale was also utilized to assess the condition of both facilities and equipment valued over \$50,000.

Table 3. Useful Life Benchmark

Vehicle Type	FTA Default ULB (years)
Automobile (AO)	8
Bus (BU)	14
Cutaway Bus (CU)	10
Van (VN)	8

Table 4. FTA's Transit Economic Requirements Model/Facilities and Equipment

Condition	Description	Rating
Excellent	No visible defects, new or near new condition, may still be under warranty if applicable	5
Good	Good condition, no longer new, may be slightly defective or deteriorated; overall functional	4
Adequate	Moderately deteriorated or defective; has not exceeded useful life	3
Marginal	Defective or deteriorated in need of replacement; exceeded useful life	2
Poor	Critically damaged or in need of immediate repair; well past useful life	1

Table 5. Van (ULB 8 Years)

Condition	Mileage	Rating
Excellent	0–25,000	5
Good	25,001–75,000	4.9–3.8
Adequate	75,001–100,000	3.7–2.6
Marginal	100,001–150,000	2.5–1.4
Poor	150,001+	1.3–0

Table 6. Light Duty 25 feet or less (ULB 10 Years)

Condition	Mileage	Rating
Excellent	0–30,000	5
Good	30,001–90,000	4.9–4
Adequate	90,001–150,000	3.9–3.0
Marginal	150,000–210,000	2.9–2
Poor	210,000+	1.9–0

Table 7. Medium Duty Cutaway

Condition	Mileage	Rating
Excellent	0–40,000	5
Good	40,001–120,000	4.9–4
Adequate	120,001–200,000	3.9–3.0
Marginal	200,001–280,000	2.9–2
Poor	280,001+	1.9–0

To determine a conditional assessment rating for each vehicle, the ULB, mileage and agency assessment were given a rating. The ratings for each criteria were then weighted (.33) and totaled for the asset condition rating (see Figure 4). Equipment and facilities were rated utilizing the TERM scale (see Table 4).


Table 8. Heavy Duty Small Bus (ULB 14 Years)

Condition	Mileage	Rating
Excellent	0–70,000	5
Good	70,001–210,000	4.9–4
Adequate	210,001–350,000	3.9–3.0
Marginal	350,001–490,000	2.9–2
Poor	490,001+	1.9–0

Table 9. Heavy Duty Large Bus (ULB 14 Years)

Condition	Mileage	Rating
Excellent	0–80,000	5
Good	80,001–240,000	4.9–4
Adequate	240,001–500,000	3.9–3.0
Marginal	500,001–640,000	2.9–2
Poor	640,000+	1.9–0

Figure 4. Vehicle Condition Methodology



ASSET PORTFOLIO AND CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Assets included in the PTT portfolio include all FTA funded assets that are within their ULB. However, the portfolio also includes a small number of non-FTA funded Section 5310 assets provided by subrecipients and all known Section 5311 assets. In total, this 2017 TAM Plan includes 200 vehicles, 58 facilities, and 4 types of equipment (see Tables 10–13). See Appendix A for a complete list of all assets and their condition assessment.

Table 10. Vehicle Condition Assessment

Asset Type	#	Average Year Built	Average Age (years)	% of ULB	Term Scale Age (years)	TERM Mileage (miles)	Agency Assessment (years)	Total Average (years)	Replacement Cost Range
Cutaway	132	2011	5.8	55	3	3.7	3.8	3.5	\$65,000–\$150,000
Bus	44	2011	6.1	51	3	3.5	3.6	3.4	\$350,000–\$1,000,000
Van	23	2011	5.8	55	3	3.7	3.7	3.5	\$40,000–\$65,000
Trolleybus	1	2016	1.0	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	\$600,000

Table 11. Percent of vehicles below the TERM “Adequate” Rating

Asset Type	% < Adequate Condition CY 2017	% > Adequate Condition CY 2017
Cutaway	30	70
Bus	43	57
Van	43	57
Trolleybus	0	100

Table 12. Facility Condition Assessment

Asset Type	#	Year Built	Average Age (years)	% of ULB	TERM Scale Age (years)	Agency Assessment (years)	Total Average (years)
Facility	58	2010	6.8	0.3	3.7	3.7	3.6

Table 13. Equipment Condition Assessment

Asset Type	#	Year Built	Average Age (years)	Agency Assessment (years)
Equipment	4	2014	2.8	4.5

PERFORMANCE TARGETS

The PTT, subrecipients and users are fortunate to have assets that reliably provide safe and efficient service. The average age for the majority of assets is within their designated ULB and, perhaps most importantly, the average condition rating for each asset type falls within the TERM “adequate” rating. The overall condition average for the fleet is a 3.8, approaching “good” on the TERM scale (see Table 10). It should be noted that while the overall score is “adequate” a large percentage of bus and van assets fall below the “adequate” rating (see Table 11). The ratings are low due to continued use beyond the ULB; however, subrecipients continue to replace these assets each year and increase the overall asset condition rating. In addition, interest in vans has increased due to innovation and design improvements in ADA accessibility.

Growing demand, competition for funds, and increasing costs require that the PTT and subrecipients continue to ensure that assets are maintained in an SGR. Efforts must be made to ensure that assets are adequately maintained throughout their useful life and beyond. Using performance measures will aid in the

ongoing management of all assets, will ensure that limited funding is utilized wisely, and will ensure that assets do not put the public's safety in jeopardy.

Performance measures for 2018 include:

- **Maintain an overall average for each vehicle category at a 3.4 or better**
- **Maintain an overall average of 3.5 for all facilities and equipment**
- **Increase the van and bus “adequate” ratings from 43 to 45 percent**

Long-term measure:

- **The PTT and subrecipients will maintain an “adequate” rating for all asset categories**

MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The PTT utilizes sound management practices to manage the FTA funded programs in accordance with the grant application, FTA Master Agreement, and all applicable laws and regulations. FTA gives UDOT the maximum discretion permitted by law in designing and managing the programs to meet statewide mobility needs. As a pass-through of FTA funds, the PTT manages an annual multi-step application process that ranges from the announcement of funds to contracting with subrecipients. The PTT analyzes the risk of funding each applicant by scoring applications based on established criteria, including past compliance and demonstrated managerial, financial, and technical capacity of the applicant.

Prioritization and Risk Management

FTA Section 5310 Program

The Section 5310 grant program requires projects to be identified in a Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (coordinated plan) developed by a lead local agency. The PTT has designated the six Associations of Governments as the local planning agencies to complete these plans for their regions.

The PTT provides guidance to the lead local agency on the minimum requirements of the coordinated plan process to ensure projects are eligible for FTA grant program funding. Though encouraged to do so, Section 5311 and Section 5339 projects are not required to be part of the coordinated plan. They do, however, need to be part of the *Utah STIP and Unified Long Range Plan*.

Section 5311 and Section 5339

In addition to the annual application process, the PTT requires that all fixed route transit providers have an adopted capital improvement plan identifying capital projects, approximate costs, and the year of implementation. Understanding that needs are large and the funding is limited, it is critical for all fixed route providers to understand all of the statewide needs. The PTT holds an annual meeting with all of the providers in order to review the list of priorities, discuss project schedules and ensure that all parties are in agreement with the funding priorities for a given year.

Site Visits and Inspections

The PTT conducts biennial site visits and inspections of its subrecipients; however, the PTT may perform site visits and inspections on a more frequent basis, if deemed necessary. Reasons for more frequent visits include, but are not limited to, numerous follow-up items on previous visits; complaints regarding service, vehicles, or other items; or frequent PTT Online alerts (PTT's grant management system). Site visits and

inspections are performed by the Compliance Officer and include a comprehensive review of the funded activities. Complete inspections of the property on-site are done for 100 percent of the assets if the subrecipient has two or less assets. For subrecipients with more than two assets, assets are randomly selected and at least 50 percent are inspected, including facilities and equipment.

The PTT has developed standard forms that include specific questions about vehicles, facilities, equipment, and operations. Once the subrecipient review is complete, a final report is sent to the subrecipient and Program Manager. Any follow-up items with time frames for responses are identified in this report. It is the Compliance Officer's responsibility to track and verify that follow-up items are addressed and documented. All site visit and inspection dates and findings are tracked in PTT Online and summarized in the agency compliance log.

Reporting and Performance Measure Oversight

The PTT uses the PTT Online system to collect reporting, performance measure, and maintenance data from subrecipients. PTT Online includes internal deadlines and established objectives and requirements so it can track if dates or minimum requirements are being met. When requirements are not met, PTT Online e-mails an alert to the subrecipient and PTT staff. PTT Online includes a reporting and tracking field for the items listed below:

- Quarterly reporting
- Vehicle mileage and trips
- Pre-trip surveillance
- Preventative maintenance
- Accidents and incidents

Vehicle Title and Lien

Subrecipients must include UDOT as a lien holder when completing registration, insurance, and other forms. The lien or covenant will be released when the useful life and disposition standards have been met and any non-compliance findings are resolved. The federal interest expires when the property reaches its useful life and the vehicle value is less than \$5,000. These requirements exist to protect the federal interest and to maintain continuing control over property.

Useful Life Benchmark

The Useful Life Benchmark indicates the expected lifetime of capital purchases, or the acceptable period of use in service. When the useful life has been reached and the vehicle has a resale value of less than \$5,000, the PTT returns the property title or ownership documents to the subrecipient and cancels its lien.

PTT, at its discretion, may extend useful life of capital purchases. Situations, including non-compliance of Federal and/or PTT regulations and contracts, non-use of equipment, low vehicle miles and inconsistent maintenance, are examples of where by PTT may extend a vehicle's useful life.

Vehicles

Useful life of vehicles begins on the date the subrecipient takes possession of the vehicle and continues until the vehicle reaches the useful life minimum criteria (see Table 14). The useful life minimum refers to total time or miles in revenue service, not time spent stockpiled or otherwise unavailable for regular transit use.

Facilities

With regular maintenance, assets will operate at the same level on first and last day of service, throughout their useful life. In general, assets within their useful life are considered to be in an SGR. The FTA website states that the “state of good repair is the condition where all assets perform their assigned functions without limitation.” Subrecipients must apply the following useful life standards to facilities funded through the PTT:

- **Passenger shelters:** Such as pre-fabricated metal, glass, Plexiglas, and stick-frame structures; useful life of 20 years
- **Bus barns:** Such as site-built “pole barns” or other stick-frame barns; useful life of 40 years
- **Administration and maintenance buildings:** Including building additions; useful life of 40 years
- **Concrete pavement infrastructure:** Useful life of 20 years
- **Fencing:** Useful life of 20 years
- **Office furniture:** Useful life of 10 years

Other Equipment

For other equipment with an acquisition value greater than \$5,000, the PTT determines useful life standards on a case-by-case basis that reflects the manufacturer’s estimated useful life. The subrecipient should propose a useful life in its project proposal.

Disposal

UDOT will release the lien when the useful life and disposition standards have been met and any non-compliance findings are resolved. The federal interest expires when the property reaches its useful life and the vehicle value is less than \$5,000. These requirements exist to protect the federal interest and to maintain continuing control over property. After the minimum useful life of project property is reached and is no longer needed for the original project or program, it may be used by the grantee for other transit projects or program.

Selling Prior to Meeting the Useful Life

If a subrecipient desires to dispose of the property before it meets the end of its useful life benchmark, the property may be sold with the PTT and FTA approval. However, FTA is entitled to its share of the remaining Federal interest. The Federal interest is determined by calculating the fair market value of the project property immediately before the occurrence prompting the withdrawal of the project property from appropriate use.

The UDOT PTT will apply a straight-line depreciation formula to vehicles to assist in determining the depreciated value of federally funded vehicles. The subrecipient may also auction the vehicle in place of utilizing the straight-line depreciation.

If the subrecipient receives insurance proceeds when the property has been lost or damaged by fire, casualty, or natural disaster, the subrecipient must apply those proceeds to the cost of replacing the property or return to the PTT an amount equal to the remaining federal interest in the property.

Selling After the Useful Life Benchmark

Prior to selling the vehicle, the subrecipient must notify the PTT of its intent. The PTT will work with the subrecipient to identify the value of the vehicle. The PTT will apply the straight-line depreciation formula to assist in determining the depreciated value of federally funded vehicles (see Table 14 and Table 15).

If the subrecipient chooses to sell the vehicle, and the market value of the vehicle is \$5,000 or more, the PTT requires reimbursement of the proportionate share (80 percent federal/20 percent local) of the net proceeds from the sale. Reimbursed proceeds will go back into the grant program from which the vehicle funds were utilized. The funds will then be shown in future grant applications. FTA has no federal interest in vehicles with a fair market value of less than \$5,000.

Table 14. Example of Straight Line Depreciation

Cost (purchase price)	\$48,000
Salvage (estimated value)*	\$7,900
Life (years in service)	5
Depreciation (cost-salvage/life)	\$8,020.00

*based on estimated value - commercialtrucktrader.com

Table 15. Detailed Example of Straight Line Depreciation (continued from Table 14)

Year	Vehicle Value	Vehicle Depreciation	Depreciated Value
1	\$48,000	\$8,020	\$39,980
2	\$39,980	\$8,020	\$31,960
3	\$31,960	\$8,020	\$23,940
4	\$23,940	\$8,020	\$15,920
5	\$15,920	\$8,020	\$7,900
6	<\$5,000		

APPENDIX A

Vehicles

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Ability First	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	4	3.0
Active Re-Entry	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	5	5	4.0
Active Re-Entry	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	5	4	3.7
Active Re-Entry	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	5	5	4.3
Bear River Valley Senior Center/ Tremonton City	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	5	5	4.0
Bear River Valley Senior Center/ Tremonton City	VN - Van	7	8	0.9	1	4.4	5	3.5
Beaver Area Health Care Foundation	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	5	3	3.7
Beaver County Senior Citizens Organization Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	4.5	3	2.8
Cache County Corporation Senior Citizens	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	4	3.2
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	4	4.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	4	4.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	4	4.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	3	3	2.3
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4	3	3.0
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4	4	3.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	4	3	2.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	2	2.5

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	3	2.8
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3.5	4	3.8
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3.5	4	3.8
Cache Employment & Training Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	4	3.2
Cache Employment & Training Center	VN - Van	6	8	0.8	2	5	4	3.7
Cache Employment & Training Center	VN - Van	6	8	0.8	2	5	4	3.7
Cedar City Corporation	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3	4	3.7
Cedar City Corporation	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
Cedar City Corporation	CU - Cutaway Bus	11	10	1.1	0	0.5	4	1.5
Cedar City Corporation	VN - Van	10	8	1.3	0	0.6	3	1.2
Cedar City Corporation	VN - Van	2	8	0.3	4	4.4	5	4.5
Cedar City Corporation	VN - Van	2	8	0.3	4	4.4	5	4.5
City of Draper (SCCC)	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	3	2.7
City of Sandy (SCCC)	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	3	4	2.7
City of South Jordan	CU - Cutaway Bus	3	10	0.3	4	4.5	5	4.5
City of South Jordan	VN - Van	3	8	0.4	4	5	5	4.7
City of South Salt Lake	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4	3	3.0
City of West Jordan (SCCC)	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	2	2.3
Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	4.5	4	4.2
Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4.5	4	3.8

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	VN - Van	10	8	1.3	0	3.1	3	2.0
Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	VN - Van	11	8	1.4	0	1.9	3	1.6
Community Careers and Support Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	5	4	4.0
Community Careers and Support Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4.5	4	3.8
Community Careers and Support Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4	4	3.7
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	4	3.0
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	4	3.0
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	3	10	0.3	4	4.5	5	4.5
Davis County Senior Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	0.5	2	1.5
Duchesne County Senior Citizens	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	3	3	2.3
Duchesne County Senior Citizens	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	3.5	4	2.8
East Juab Senior Citizens Organization	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	4	3.5
Emery County Nursing Home Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	3	4	2.7
Emery County Senior Citizens, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	5	4	3.7
Emery County Senior Citizens, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	4	3.5
Emery County Senior Citizens, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	4	3.2
EnableUtah	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3	4	3.0

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Foundations for Independence	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	4	3.2
Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	3	2	2.0
Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4	4	3.7
Garfield County	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	4	3.5
Garfield County	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	4	3.5
Iron County Aging Council Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	4.5	4	3.2
Kane County Senior Citizens Improvement Corp	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	4	4.7
Kane County Senior Citizens Improvement Corp	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	4.5	3	2.8
Kane County Senior Citizens Improvement Corp	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	4	3	2.7
Kostopulos Dream Foundation/Camp Kostopulos	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Milford Memorial Hospital Association	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	5	5	4.7
Navajo Nation Transit System	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	14	0.4	3	4	4	3.7
Navajo Nation Transit System	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	14	0.4	3	4	4	3.7

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Neighborhood House Association	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	3.5	3	2.5
Neighborhood House Association	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	4	3.2
Odyssey House, Inc.-Utah	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	4.5	4	3.8
Odyssey House, Inc.-Utah	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	4.5	4	4.2
Odyssey House, Inc.-Utah	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	4	3	3.0
Options for Independence	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	4.5	4	3.8
Options for Independence	VN - Van	10	8	1.3	0	3.1	4	2.4
Pahvant Valley Senior Citizens	CU - Cutaway Bus	9	10	0.9	1	4.5	4	3.2
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	0	14	0.0	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	0	14	0.0	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	0	14	0.0	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	0	14	0.0	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	3	3	2.7
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	7	14	0.5	3	3	3	3.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	7	14	0.5	3	3	3	3.0
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	2.5	3	2.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	7	14	0.5	3	2.5	3	2.8
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2.5	3	2.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	7	14	0.5	3	2.5	3	2.8
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2.5	3	2.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2.5	3	2.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2.5	3	2.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	12	14	0.9	1	2	1	1.3
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	12	14	0.9	1	2	2	1.7
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	2	3	2.3

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	2	3	2.3
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	1.5	3	2.2
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	12	14	0.9	1	1.5	1	1.2
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	1.5	3	2.2
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	12	14	0.9	1	1.5	2	1.5
Park City Transit	BU - Bus	11	14	0.8	2	1.5	3	2.2
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	14	14	1.0	1	4	2	2.3
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	2.5	2	2.2
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	2.5	2	2.2
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	2.5	2	2.2
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	2	2.5
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	2	2.5
Park City Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	2	2.5
Park City Transit	TB - Trolleybus	1	14	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Park City Transit	A0 - Automobile	8	14	0.6	3	3.8	2	2.9
Park City Transit	A0 - Automobile	8	14	0.6	3	3.1	2	2.7
Park City Transit	A0 - Automobile	8	14	0.6	3	2.5	2	2.5
Park City Transit	A0 - Automobile	15	8	1.9	0	0	2	0.7
Payson Senior Citizens Development	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	4.5	4	3.5
Piute County Senior Citizen Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	2	10	0.2	5	5	5	5.0
Red Rock Center for Independence	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	5	5	4.7
Red Rock Center for Independence	VN - Van	4	8	0.5	3	3.1	4	3.4
Red Rock Center for Independence	A0 - Automobile	8	8	1.0	1	2.5	3	2.2
Red Rock Center for Independence	VN - Van	9	8	1.1	0	1.3	4	1.8
Salt Lake County Aging Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	3	2.7
Salt Lake County Aging Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	3	2.8
Sevier County	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	4.5	3	2.8
Sevier County	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3.5	3	2.8

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Southwest Behavioral Health Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4.5	4	3.8
Southwest Behavioral Health Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	4.5	4	3.5
SPLORE	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	4.5	3	3.2
Summit County	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	4	3.5
Suntran	A0 - Automobile	1	8	0.1	5	5	4	4.7
Suntran	VN - Van	3	8	0.4	4	5	5	4.7
Suntran	BU - Bus	3	14	0.2	4	4.5	5	4.5
Suntran	BU - Bus	3	14	0.2	4	4.5	5	4.5
Suntran	BU - Bus	3	14	0.2	4	4.5	5	4.5
Suntran	BU - Bus	3	14	0.2	4	4	5	4.3
Suntran	BU - Bus	6	14	0.4	3	3	4	3.3
Suntran	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2	3	2.3
Suntran	BU - Bus	9	14	0.6	2	2	3	2.3
Suntran	BU - Bus	12	14	0.9	1	0.5	2	1.2
Suntran	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Suntran	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	5	5	4.7
Suntran	VN - Van	5	8	0.6	2	3.1	3	2.7
Suntran	VN - Van	6	8	0.8	2	1.9	2	2.0
Transitions Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	3	3.2
Transitions Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4.5	3	3.2
Transitions Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4.5	4	3.8
Transitions Inc.	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
TURN Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
TURN Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	3	10	0.3	4	3	4	3.7
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	3	10	0.3	4	3	4	3.7
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	1.5	3	2.5
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	0	3	2.0
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	0	3	2.0
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	2	10	0.2	5	4.5	5	4.8
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	CU - Cutaway Bus	2	10	0.2	5	4.5	5	4.8
Uintah Healthcare Special Service District	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	4	3	3.0
Uintah Healthcare Special Service District	CU - Cutaway Bus	6	10	0.6	3	4	4	3.7
Uintah Healthcare Special Service District	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	4	3	3.0
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3	4	3.7
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	3	1	2.3
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3	4	3.7
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	3	1	2.3
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3	4	3.7
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3	4	3.7

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	2	1	2.0
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	5	10	0.5	3	2	1	2.0
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	1.5	1	1.2
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	4.5	5	4.8
United Way Community Services	CU - Cutaway Bus	4	10	0.4	4	3.5	3	3.5
USU - CPD - Developmental Skills Laboratory	VN - Van	2	8	0.3	4	5	3	4.0
USU - CPD - Developmental Skills Laboratory	VN - Van	5	8	0.6	2	3.1	3	2.7
Utah Independent Living Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	3.5	4	3.2
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	5	3.5	3	3.8
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	5	2	3	3.3
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	2	4	2.3
Ute Tribe Transit	CU - Cutaway Bus	10	10	1.0	1	2	4	2.3
Washington County (on behalf of Council On Aging)	CU - Cutaway Bus	1	10	0.1	5	5	5	5.0

Provider	Vehicle Type	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Washington County (on behalf of Council On Aging)	CU - Cutaway Bus	8	10	0.8	2	3	3	2.7
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	1	8	0.1	5	5	5	5.0
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	2	8	0.3	4	5	5	4.7
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	4	8	0.5	3	5	5	4.3
Work Activity Center	CU - Cutaway Bus	7	10	0.7	2	5	4	3.7
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	5	4	1.3	2	5	4	3.7
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	9	8	1.1	0	4.4	3	2.5
Work Activity Center	VN - Van	7	8	0.9	1	3.8	4	2.9

Facilities

Asset Name	Year Built	Replacement Cost	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Maintenance Building	2010	350,000	7	30	0.2	4	N/A	5	4.5
Public Works Building	1997	TBD	20	40	0.5	3	N/A	3	3
Transit Housing Bus Barn	2013	TBD	4	40	0.1	4	N/A	4	4
Bus Barn	2011	10,000,000	6	30	0.2	4	N/A	3	3.5
Kimball Junction Transit Center	2016	TBD	1	40	0.0	5	N/A	5	5
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	15,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	22,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	12,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4

Asset Name	Year Built	Replacement Cost	Age (model year)	ULB	% of ULB	TERM Age	TERM Mileage	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Bus Shelter	TBD	12,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	22,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	25,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	22,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	22,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	15,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3.5	3.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	17,500	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	25,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	22,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	40,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Old Town Transit Center	TBD	TBD	TBD	40	TBD	TBD	N/A	3	3
Bus Shelter	TBD	15,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	2.5	2.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	3.5	3.5
Bus Shelter	TBD	20,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	4	4
Bus Shelter	TBD	30,000	TBD	10	TBD	TBD	N/A	5	5
Transit Administration Building	2011	1,024,352	6	40	0.2	4	N/A	4	4
Fleet Garage Bay Addition	2008	1,905,095	9	30	0.3	4	N/A	4	4
Harmon's Bus Shelter	2010	6,743	7	10	0.7	3	N/A	4	3.5
City Office Bus Shelter	2005	29,391	12	10	1.2	1	N/A	4	2.5
Lin's Bus Shelter	2015	5,550	2	10	0.2	4	N/A	4	4
Southwest BH Bus Shelter	2015	5,550	2	10	0.2	4	N/A	4	4
Target Bus Shelter	2015	5,550	2	10	0.2	4	N/A	4	4
Transit Center	2006	168,267	11	40	0.3	4	N/A	4	4

Equipment

Agency Name	Asset Name	Year Built	Replacement \$	TERM Agency	TERM Weighted Average
Park City Transit	Overhead bus charger	2017	349,000	5	5
Park City Transit	Overhead bus charger	2017	349,000	5	5
Park City Transit	TH255 Telehandler	2012	92,000	4	4
Park City Transit	M30 Sweeper/Scrubber	2011	73,837	4	4

APPENDIX B

	AGENCY	ACCOUNTABLE EXECUTIVE
1	Active Re-Entry	Nancy Bentley
2	Bear River Valley Senior Center/Tremonton City	Roger Fridal
3	Beaver Area Health Care Foundation	Kristen Sisneros
4	Beaver County Senior Citizens Organization Inc.	Sheila Shotwell
5	Cache County Corporation Senior Citizens	Kristine Johnson
6	Cache Employment & Training Center	Kae Lynn Beecher
7	Cedar City Corporation	Ryan Marshall
8	City of Draper (SCCC)	Troy Walker
9	City of Midvale (SCCC)	JoAnn Seghini
10	City of Sandy (SCCC)	Tom Dolan
11	City of South Jordan	Dave Alvord
12	City of South Salt Lake	Cherie Wood
13	City of West Jordan (SCCC)	Kim Rolfe
14	Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	Sammie Mcfarlane
15	Community Careers and Support Services	Robert McKnight
16	Davis County Senior Services Davis County Courthouse Annex	Debbie Draper
17	Duchesne County Senior Citizens	Laurie Brummond
18	East Juab Senior Citizens Organization	Allen Ricks
19	Emery County Nursing Home Inc. (Emery County Care & Rehab)	Eileen Baker
20	Emery County Senior Citizens, Inc	Shawna Horrocks
21	EnableUtah	Justine Scott
22	Foundations for Independence	Kathy Fleming
23	Four Corners Community Behavioral Health, Inc.	Jeanie Willson
24	Garfield County	Donna Chynoweth
25	Greyhound Lines Inc.	LePhan Quach
26	Iron County Aging Council	Curtis Crawford
27	Kane County Senior Citizens Improvement Corp	Fayann Christensen
28	Kostopulos Dream Foundation/Camp Kostopulos	Mircea Divricean
29	Milford Memorial Hospital Association	Nannette Davis
30	Navajo Nation Transit System	Harrison Smith
31	Neighborhood House Association	Jacob Brace
32	Odyssey House	Adam Cohen
33	Options for Independence	Cheryl Atwood
34	Pahvant Valley Senior Citizens	Doris Rasmussen
35	Park City Transit	Daren Davis
36	Payson Senior Citizens Development	Rick Moore
37	Piute County Senior Citizen Center	Virginia Tyree
38	Red Rock Center for Independence	Barbara Lefler
39	Salt Lake County Aging Services	Ben McAdams
40	Sevier County	Georgette Harvey
41	Southwest Behavioral Health Center	Neal Smith
42	SPLORE	Bob Henson
43	Summit County	Tom Fisher
44	Suntran	Fred Davies
45	Transitions Inc.	Wayne Asbury
46	Tri-County Independent Living Center of Utah	Andy Curry
47	TURN Community Services	Phil Shumway
48	Uintah Basin Association of Governments	Kaleb Bench
49	Uintah Healthcare Special Service District	Mitch Migliori
50	United Way Community Services	William Hulterstrom
51	USU - CPD - Developmental Skills Laboratory	Drake Rasmussen

	AGENCY	ACCOUNTABLE EXECUTIVE
52	Ute Tribe Transit	Woody Cesspooch
53	Washington County (on behalf of Council On Aging)	Christine Holiday
54	Work Activity Center	Kathryn McConaughy